



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,017	06/16/2006	Jean-Louis H. Gueret	05725.1471	8808
22852	7590	12/24/2008		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER	
			SULLIVAN, DANIELLE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/24/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/538,017	Applicant(s) GUERET, JEAN-LOUIS H.
	Examiner DANIELLE SULLIVAN	Art Unit 1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 36-75 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 36-45 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 46-75 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 June 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTC/G6/r08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0/16/2006, 2/19/2008 and 11/14/2008</u>	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of 46-75 in the reply filed on 9/22/2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 36-45 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claims 36-75 are pending examination. Claims 46-75 are under examination.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

Art Unit: 1616

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 46-75 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15 and 17-43 of copending Application No. 11/123,173. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

The present claims are directed towards a device comprising an applicator and a container holding a cosmetic product, excluding depilatory wax, wherein the device is configured to be heated in a microwave oven.

173' teaches the same device incorporating an elongated shape. 173' does not exclude the cosmetic product from being a depilatory wax. However, the present claims are encompassed by the invention of 173'. Therefore, it would have been *prima-facie* obvious from the teachings of 173' to use the device on cosmetics, excluding depilatory waxes.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 46-62, 64, 65 and 67-75 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Desnos (US 6,174,319).

Desnos discloses a device for packaging a cosmetic product comprising an applicator and a container containing the cosmetic product, wherein the device is configured to be heated in a microwave oven, and the cosmetic product is for epilatory waxes (column 1, lines 31-41). The device further comprises an indicator sensitive to temperature of the cosmetic (column 2, lines 23-28). The indicator is integral with the container and is thermochromic (column 3, lines 2-10). The container is composed of wood or plastic. The color change occurs over a defined temperature range and is reversible (column 3, lines 37-40; column 4, lines 45-49). The device further comprises a closure element configured to close the container which may additionally comprise the indicator (column 4, lines 2-9). The container comprises different layers of plastic materials (column 6, lines 20-22). The device may be inverted prior to use so that wax

can flow out of the container via the outlet of the applicator device (column 5, lines 59 thru column 6, line 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 63 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desnos (US 6,174,319).

Applicant's Invention

Applicant claims the device as addressed in above 102(b) rejection. The container further has a reference mark configured to indicate to a user a position wherein the device should be placed. The device includes a notice informing a user that the device may be placed in a microwave.

Determination of the scope and the content of the prior art

(MPEP 2141.01)

The teaching of Desnos is addressed in above 102(b) rejection.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims

(MPEP 2141.02)

Desnos does not teach instructions for using the device. It is well-settled law that combining printed instructions and an old product into a kit will not render the claimed invention nonobvious even if the instructions detail a new use for the product. See *In re Ngai*, 367 F.3d 1336, 1339, 70 USPQ2d 1862, 1864 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Finding of prima facie obviousness

Rationale and Motivation (MPEP 2142-2143)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Desnos to further include instructions for use because combining printed instructions and an old product into a kit will not render the claimed invention nonobvious. One would have been motivated to include instructions to ensure proper use of the product. *In re Ngai*

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Boilen et al. (US 2003/0003118).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Danielle Sullivan whose telephone number is (571) 270-3285. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM Mon-Thur EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571) 272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Danielle Sullivan
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1616

/Johann R. Richter/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616